

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JARED WAYNE HUFF,

Plaintiff,

v.

KILOLO KIJAKAZI, Commissioner of  
Social Security,

Defendant.

CASE NUMBER: 1:20-cv-00821-GSA

**ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF  
DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE BRIEF  
DEADLINE**

The parties stipulate to a 30-day extension of time from September 30, 2021 to October 29, 2021 for Defendant to file a response brief because counsel was newly assigned to this case after the former counsel of record left the office. This is Defendant's second extension in this case and the first for this deadline.

The Scheduling Order allows for a single extension of thirty days by the stipulation of the parties. Doc. 7 at 3. Beyond the single extension by stipulation, "requests to modify [the scheduling] order must be made by written motion and will be granted only for good cause." *Id.*

When considering whether good cause exists to modify a scheduling order, courts consider the foreseeability of the impediment to meeting the deadline and the party's diligence in seeking the extension once it became apparent they could not meet the deadline. *See Sharp v. Covenant Care LLC*, 288 F.R.D. 465, 467 (S.D. Cal. 2012); *Ordaz Gonzalez v. Cty. of Fresno*, No. 1:18-CV-01558-BAM, 2020 WL 2539287, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. May 19, 2020). The Court has the inherent power to manage its own docket to achieve an orderly and expeditious resolution of cases. *Southern California Edison Co. v. Lynch*, 307 F.3d 794 (9th Cir. 2002).

Counsel's recent assignment to the matter is good cause for an extension, which counsel

1 sought well in advance of the September 30 deadline.

2 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant's deadline to file a response brief is extended  
3 to and including October 29, 2021. All other deadlines are adjusted accordingly.

4  
5  
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: September 22, 2021

/s/ Gary S. Austin  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE